

# **OPINIONS OF EXPERIENCED METRO-AREA LANDLORDS REGARDING SMOKING POLICIES & PRACTICES**

## **Focus Group Summary Report**

**Research conducted with landlords in:  
Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington County, Oregon  
and Clark County, Washington**

**Conducted for:**  
**American Lung Association of Oregon  
Multnomah County, Oregon  
Clark County, Washington  
& partner agencies**

**Research conducted in November 2006**

---

**CAMPBELL  
DELONG  
RESOURCES, INC.**

---

[www.cdri.com](http://www.cdri.com)



---

## INTRODUCTION

---

The American Lung Association of Oregon, the Multnomah County Health Department, Clark County Public Health, and partner agencies contracted with Campbell DeLong Resources, Inc. to conduct a multi-dimensional research project to study smoking rules and practices among tenants and landlords in the Portland metro area. In the first phase of that research, a Tenant Survey was conducted in June and July of 2006. This report covers the next phase of the project: six focus groups held with landlords who restrict smoking and those who do not restrict smoking, held in November 2006. The report builds on what we learned from the earlier phases of the research and is divided into the following sections:

- ▶ *Executive Summary*, providing an overview of the key findings from the research.
- ▶ *Methods*, providing a review of how the research was conducted.
- ▶ *Research Results*, outlining the findings from the research.
- ▶ *Appendix*, containing a copy of the one-page summary of the tenant research results that was provided to each focus group participant.

Direct questions or comments about this research to John H. Campbell at Campbell DeLong Resources, Inc., (503) 221-2005, or e-mail [John@cdri.com](mailto:John@cdri.com). At the American Lung Association of Oregon, contact Diane Laughter, Tobacco Program Manager, (503) 924-4094, or e-mail [diane@lungoregon.org](mailto:diane@lungoregon.org).

## RESEARCH SPONSORSHIP

---

---

The research analyzed in this report was conducted by Campbell DeLong Resources, Inc. in response to a request by a consortium of public and non-profit agencies led by the American Lung Association of Oregon, Multnomah County Health Department, and Clark County Public Health. In Oregon this work is supported by a grant from the American Legacy Foundation and in Washington by Community Choices 2010 and grant funding from STEPS to a Healthier Clark County.

The Smokefree Apartments Advisory Board, whose mission is to provide input to the American Lung Association of Oregon and the Multnomah County Tobacco Prevention Program in their work to develop strategies to reduce secondhand smoke in multi-unit housing in the Portland tri-county area, is comprised of member representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- African American Tobacco Prevention Network
- Asian Family Center Tobacco Prevention Program
- City of Portland Bureau of Housing and Community Development
- City of Portland Office of Neighborhood Involvement
- Community Alliance of Tenants
- Community Development Network
- Department of Human Services, Occupational and Environmental Epidemiology
- Environmental Justice Action Group
- Fair Housing Council of Oregon
- Housing Authority of Portland
- Housing Connections
- Metro Multi-Family Housing Association
- Multnomah County Environmental Health Program
- Oregon Human Development Corporation/ Latino Tobacco Prevention Network
- Portland Development Commission
- Tobacco-Free Coalition of Clark County
- Tobacco-Free Coalition of Oregon
- Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue
- Vancouver Housing Authority
- Independent tenant and small landlord representatives

Campbell DeLong Resources, Inc., an independent market research firm based in Portland, Oregon, developed a focus group recruiting screener and discussion guide, and gathered feedback from the American Lung Association of Oregon, Multnomah County Health Department, and Clark County Public Health. The focus groups were conducted by Campbell DeLong Resources, Inc. As such, the resulting analysis and conclusions presented in this report do not necessarily reflect the opinions or viewpoints of the American Lung Association of Oregon, the Multnomah County Health Department, Clark County Public Health, or of other partnering or funding agencies.

## OPINIONS OF EXPERIENCED METRO-AREA LANDLORDS REGARDING SMOKING POLICIES & PRACTICES

### Focus Group Summary Report

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

---

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
METHODS .....	4
RESEARCH RESULTS.....	7
Participant Characteristics .....	7
What Experienced Landlords Agree on About Smoking in Rental Housing.....	9
The Non-Smoking Choice: <i>Perspectives of Landlords     Who Forbid Indoor Smoking</i> .....	14
The Choice to Allow Smoking: <i>Perspectives of     Smoking-Permitted Landlords</i> .....	21
APPENDIX.....	23



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

---

The goal of the research is to better understand motivations, perceived benefits, and roadblocks for landlords to institute no-smoking policies at their properties. A total of six focus groups were conducted in November 2006: three with landlords who currently have no-smoking policies at some or all of their properties and three with landlords who do *not* currently restrict smoking. Four of the groups were held in Portland, Oregon and two were held in Clark County, Washington.

### PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS (PAGE 7)

- ▶ Participants represent a range of companies and number of units owned/managed.
- ▶ Significantly, the quality of rentals includes both high-end and low-end, *regardless* of smoking policies.
- ▶ While all the landlords in the focus groups are experienced, their level of expertise varies.
- ▶ Very few landlords interviewed are smokers themselves and none of those who smoke currently do so inside their own homes.

### WHAT EXPERIENCED LANDLORDS AGREE ON ABOUT SMOKING IN RENTAL HOUSING (PAGE 9)

- ▶ The cost of cleaning, repairing, deodorizing, and repainting a unit after renting to indoor smokers is, by far and away, the biggest objection that landlords have about smoking in rental housing.
- ▶ The fire hazard caused by smoking is also a substantial concern, though for most it doesn't rise to the same level of concern as the cost of cleaning and repair.
- ▶ For landlords, concerns about *outdoor* smoking are much less significant than those they hold for indoor smoking. Yes, there are litter and clean-up issues, but most are comfortable permitting smoking outside.
- ▶ For various reasons discussed in the report, health issues generally, and secondhand smoke specifically, are not major motivators for many of the landlords interviewed.
- ▶ While all landlords perceive that non-smokers often "*take better care of themselves and their homes,*" it is the assumptions made about this point that vary. Smoking-permitted landlords equate cleanliness habits with income level and, as such, believe that nonsmoking rules are

not viable in affordable and subsidized housing. Both the past tenant research, and the experience of landlord who don't allow smoking, indicate that this assumption is inaccurate.

- ▶ Despite their expressed judgments about smokers, virtually all landlords interviewed have sympathy for their indoor smoking tenants as well. For example, most would “grandfather” existing indoor smokers during a change over, rather than force them to take it outside.
- ▶ All recognize that the societal trend is toward more restrictions on smoking.
- ▶ Not all are clear on the extent to which a landlord can limit smoking.
- ▶ While landlords’ *experience* validates the key finding of tenant research results – namely, that very few of their smoking tenants want to smoke indoors – their *assumptions* don’t always. It is common, for example, to assume that an indoor smoking ban would be seen as a significant barrier to renting to most smokers, while the reality is that most smokers in the metropolitan area, by choice, already elect not to smoke inside their homes and don’t have a need for a smoking-permitted rental unit.

#### THE NON-SMOKING CHOICE: *PERSPECTIVES OF LANDLORDS WHO FORBID INDOOR SMOKING (PAGE 14)*

- ▶ The decision to convert units to non-smoking is most commonly triggered by a particularly nasty and expensive clean-up or by the desire to keep newly built or remodeled housing in better condition longer. (Only a few have converted to non-smoking out of sense of personal conviction, often arising from seeing a family member or friend die of a smoking-related disease.)
- ▶ Without exception, the landlords who don’t allow indoor smoking would never, ever go back. What stands out from all our interviews with landlords who prohibit smoking is that *zero* regret doing so and *none* are considering going back to allowing smoking in any unit where it has been prohibited. Indeed, many said that once they tried non-smoking in one property they quickly wanted it in all. Equally, we found no landlords who currently permit smoking who had limited smoking elsewhere in the past.
- ▶ *How they did it:* For some it was a gradual process, but for others, it was as easy as “*changing the ad.*”
- ▶ *How they enforce it:* some landlords create non-smoking units with written rules, others have verbal agreements. The methods of “enforcement” are as varied as we see on many other landlord-tenant issues, and range from informal verbal discussion to by-the-book standard lease enforcement practices.
- ▶ Nearly everyone is reluctant to make their entire property (outdoors included) smokefree. While banning indoor smoking makes tremendous economic sense, banning outdoor smoking as well is not currently seen as consistently feasible or necessarily desirable.



**THE CHOICE TO ALLOW SMOKING: PERSPECTIVES OF SMOKING-PERMITTED LANDLORDS (PAGE 21)**

- ▶ Significantly, most who allow indoor smoking would *prefer* not to, “*if they could.*”
- ▶ The key reason for staying with indoor smoking is the assumption (proven inaccurate by both the tenant research and the experience of landlords who don’t allow smoking) that it would be more difficult to attract tenants if indoor smoking were not allowed.
- ▶ Other reasons for allowing indoor smoking have to do with the also-inaccurate assumption that only high-end rentals can be marketed as such successfully, some discomfort restricting what is an otherwise legal behavior, and the added effort of having to enforce another rule.

In conclusion, the research validates the key findings from the tenant surveys, demonstrating the significant economic benefit to the landlord of forbidding indoor smoking. The research also provides further support that indoor smoking bans work effectively for landlords’ bottom line (and of course tenants’ health) at all economic levels of the market.

# METHODS

---

---

## RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Specific objectives of the research include:

- ▶ Assess current practices among landlords in the Portland metropolitan area who do and do not allow smoking in their rental properties.
- ▶ Understand motivations, perceived benefits, and roadblocks for landlords to institute no-smoking policies.
- ▶ Explore landlords' reactions to the previous tenant survey findings.

## PROJECT DESIGN

A total of six focus groups were conducted: three with landlords who currently have no-smoking policies at some or all of their properties, and three with landlords who do *not* currently restrict smoking. Four of the groups were held in Portland and two were held in Clark County. In Portland, the smoking-permitted/no-smoking groups were further subdivided into smaller-scale landlords and large-complex property managers.

## PARTICIPANT CRITERIA

Participants were located for the focus groups using landlord lists provided by Housing Connections (and heavily supplemented from property management listing and rental advertising sources after those lists were called through). The following outlines the criteria used to qualify participants for each of the groups.

All participants were screened to ensure that they:

- ▶ Own or manage a sufficient number of units. (The average number of units per participant was 310, with most managing between 20 and 200 units.)
- ▶ Are responsible for, or share responsibility for, making decisions about the policies and rules that are in place at the properties they own or manage.
- ▶ Have been in the property management business for five or more years.
- ▶ No one in household works for a market research company.

In addition, the following criteria were used to qualify participants for specific groups:

- ▶ **Location.** For Portland groups, must own/manage properties in Multnomah, Clackamas, and/or Washington counties; for Vancouver groups, must own/manage properties in Clark County.
- ▶ **Smoking policies.**
  - Non-smoking:** Has one or more properties where they do not allow indoor smoking at all.
  - Smoking-permitted:** Has at least some units in every property under management where smoking is allowed.
- ▶ **Number of units.** In Portland, two groups (one non-smoking and one smoking-permitted) with landlords who manage smaller-plexes and single-family homes, and two groups with apartment managers (complexes of five units or more). In Clark County, participants in both the non-smoking and smoking-permitted groups had to manage at least one large (5+ unit) apartment complex.

## FOCUS GROUP LOGISTICS

In Portland, the focus groups were held at RDD VuPoint in downtown Portland on November 14 and 15, 2006. In Clark County, the groups were held at the Northwest Regional Training Center in Vancouver on November 16, 2006. Each of the groups lasted approximately 90 minutes.

Groups were observed live by representatives of American Lung Association of Oregon, Multnomah County Health Department, and Clark County Public Health.

The groups were moderated by John Campbell, President of Campbell DeLong Resources, Inc.

## INTERPRETING FOCUS GROUP RESEARCH

Focus groups provide a wealth of information about an issue, product, or service. CDRI has conducted hundreds of groups and has seen the results consistently validated. However, it is important for the reader to keep in mind that the purpose of this project is to explore attitudes, motivations, and opinions, and *not* frequency or distribution. When reading this report and using the information it contains, remember the following:

- ▶ Consistency and consensus are what we are looking for in focus group research. The consistency and consensus may be evident among participants in a single group or found in the responses of two or more groups. As such, it is particularly important, when watching a group live, to be careful not to give too much importance to the opinion of any one participant. Although that participant may be articulate and express a desired viewpoint, the opinion may not be that of the entire group.
- ▶ The number of people participating in a focus group is limited and participants have been carefully selected based on specific criteria. However, because the sample is small, the findings cannot be projected to a larger population on a one-to-one basis. While focus

groups provide valuable input regarding the range of opinions that exist within a population, when analyzing the focus groups, we are striving to explain how people feel and why they have a particular viewpoint, not to provide a precise percentage.

### **QUOTATIONS USED IN THIS REPORT**

The following section summarizes key research results and includes a variety of quotations from participants. All quotes are based on verbatim comments. While most quotes are direct and verbatim, some have been edited for brevity, clarity, or grammar while making every effort to avoid changing the original meaning or tone.

# RESEARCH RESULTS

---

---

## I. Participant Characteristics

As reviewed in the Methods section, three of the six focus groups were held with landlords who currently do not have any rules against smoking at their properties, and three were held with landlords who prohibit indoor smoking at some or all of their properties. While there are many differences, it is important first to note the similarities shared among all landlords in the groups:

### A. PARTICIPANTS REPRESENT A RANGE OF COMPANIES AND NUMBER OF UNITS OWNED/MANAGED.

Across all six groups, a total of over 8,900 units are represented. Most participants are managing between 20 units and 200 units. A few have less and a few have many more.

### B. THE QUALITY OF RENTALS INCLUDES BOTH HIGH-END AND LOW-END, REGARDLESS OF SMOKING POLICIES.

Although it was not part of the screening process, the landlords represent a wide range of types of rental housing, from high-rent to very affordable, including subsidized housing and Section 8 properties. Importantly, the non-smoking landlords describe a range of apartments and areas of town that are about equivalent to those who allow smoking. This is a significant finding because it demonstrates, just as we saw in the tenant research previously, that the question of whether a landlord can be successful in setting non-smoking policies is not a function of the income range to which they market. In other words, this is further validation that there is a substantial unmet demand for non-smoking housing among not just high-income earners, but also among lower-income families and individuals.

### C. WHILE ALL ARE EXPERIENCED, THEIR LEVEL OF EXPERTISE VARIES.

A requirement for participation in the groups was at least five years' experience in the property management industry. Most far exceed that number. A few participants, from family businesses, say they started working at their family's properties *"as soon as I could push a lawn mower"* and have been at it ever since. The groups also include a few ambitious young professional managers; mothers who started because it was a part-time job and stayed after their kids were grown because they *"like working with people;"* and older individuals who have been in the business *"forever."*

It is fair to say that most of these landlords believe they have seen and heard it all. When asked how their viewpoint of rental housing management has changed since they began in the business, the consistent theme is one of learning to be less naïve and developing a deeper understanding of the importance of having, and practicing, consistent, professional management approaches. *"In this business you meet a variety of nice people and you meet the*

*bums too.*" In every group we heard that experience has taught these landlords to "screen carefully" and "not get too personally involved" with tenants.

However, while they all have experience, the levels of expertise represented plainly vary. Many are sophisticated enough to be able to quote landlord-tenant law. They speak confidently not just of screening and lease enforcement but also of "resident retention strategies" designed to increase tenants' desire to stay through the use of positive tenant relations, good communication, and attention to detail in maintenance issues. On the other hand, some still seem to be on the learning curve. One participant who explains that she was "too nice" to begin with and had to become "more mean" must have been speaking in a relative sense – even in her "mean" state, she never inspects her apartments unless asked by her tenants because she doesn't wish to bother them.

#### **D. VERY FEW ARE SMOKERS THEMSELVES.**

While it is no surprise that the landlords who do not allow smoking are not smokers, even among the three groups of landlords who *do* allow smoking, only one participant is herself a smoker. Moreover, this person states firmly and matter-of-factly that she smokes outside her own home, "because I have kids."

## II. What Experienced Landlords Agree on About Smoking in Rental Housing

As will be described later in this report, there are profound differences between the landlords who allow smoking inside their units and those who don't. We'll explore those differences in depth, but first should note that all landlords do share some consistent, basic attitudes on smoking – regardless of whether or not they currently allow smoking at their properties.

### A. PRIMARILY, THEY DON'T LIKE THE TIME, EXPENSE, OR EXPERIENCE OF CLEANING UP AND REPAIRING UNITS AFTER INDOOR SMOKERS.

Landlords see a major problem with indoor smoking, but it isn't drifting secondhand smoke: it's the expense in time and materials to repair, refurbish, and otherwise clean up after tenants have smoked consistently in a rental unit. Smell, stains on walls, burns in carpets and countertops, and more smell. These are, by far and away, the major issues that landlords have with smokers. All other considerations – including health concerns – generate significantly less passion and concern.

In every group, landlords share nearly identical, vivid complaints about the effort and cost of cleaning up after indoor smokers – the only difference is that for those with non-smoking units, these are nightmares of the past that they no longer have to deal with on a regular basis, if at all. Universal complaints about the difficulty of repainting and cleaning up after indoor smokers include:

- ▶ *"The smoke permeates the walls and the drapes and it's very difficult to get the odor out without fumigating."*
- ▶ *"The windows are dripping with yellow, it's disgusting."*
- ▶ *"The smell is so hard to get out, we have to use vanilla-scented paint."*
- ▶ *"Even if you use primer-sealer, it can still bleed through. We've used an ozone machine, the whole bit; it stays there. I've had to do four coats of primer."*

In addition to the smell and stains, there is permanent damage caused by careless stubbing out of butts and cigarettes left burning:

- ▶ *"You find cigarette burns in the carpet, the vinyl, the countertops. It does a lot of damage."*
- ▶ *"We found butts everywhere, burns all over the carpet. It was horrible."*

## B. FIRE HAZARDS ARE ALSO A SUBSTANTIAL CONCERN.

Along with the repainting, smell, and damage issues, all landlords share concerns about the safety and liability hazards that smokers create on their property. Comments regarding fire safety hazards include:

- ▶ *“They fall asleep with a cigarette in hand, and the couch catches on fire. It’s a huge hassle. And it’s a huge liability.”*
- ▶ *“We had a real safety issue with people putting their cigarettes out on the carpet.”*
- ▶ *“I’ve had two places burn down because of cigarettes.”*

Almost all comments on fire safety relate to indoor smoking. However, one landlord did note an outdoor issue as well, with *“several smoldering fires in the bark dust”* due to discarded cigarettes.

## C. FOR LANDLORDS, CONCERNS ABOUT OUTDOOR SMOKING ARE MUCH LESS SIGNIFICANT THAN THOSE THEY HOLD FOR INDOOR SMOKING.

While many have strong opinions about property management problems associated with indoor smoking, concerns about *outdoor* smoking – even when done right next to the building – pale in comparison.

With a few exceptions, even those landlords who have strict no-smoking policies inside their units, still allow tenants to smoke outside. In addition, landlords who do allow smoking in their units note that most of their smoking tenants are choosing to smoke outside anyway. *“Nowadays most people who smoke don’t want to live in a smelly apartment. Or they don’t want the smoke to hurt their kids. So they step outside.”*

Nearly all the landlords, regardless of their rules for inside units, have at least some tenants who smoke outside. *“They can’t smoke in their unit, but they can smoke outside all they want.”* Some landlords provide outdoor receptacles for smokers; often the tenants have *“a lawn chair and a butt can”* on their patio or front porch. As one no-smoking landlord cheerfully comments, *“The porch is black from them stamping out the butts, but hey, at least it’s outside.”*

While the perceived downsides of allowing smoking outside pale in comparison to indoor smoking, landlords do acknowledge the following issues:

- ▶ **Some are irritated by having to deal with the mess of discarded cigarette butts.** Cleaning up after tenants who don’t properly dispose of their butts is an admitted nuisance, but not to the degree that indoor smoking is a concern. One of the more fed-up landlords described her solution this way: *“I have a guy who flicks his cigarette butts off the balcony into a pond. I started fining him \$20 per butt!”*

However, for some landlords, the outdoor smoking arrangement seems to work fine, with no major complaints: *“I have a lot of tenants who can smoke inside but they choose to step outside and smoke, the butts are on the sidewalk, you just sweep it up.”* *“We provide sand containers outside, so the butts haven’t been a real big problem.”*



- ▶ **Complaints about drifting smoke from outdoors are perceived as infrequent and, for most, not a major concern.** Landlords acknowledge that, when tenants smoke outside, the drifting smoke sometimes bothers other tenants. *“If the people downstairs are smoking on a balcony and it goes up into other apartments; that’s an issue.”* However, none describe the level of complaints they receive over such issues as significant enough to be a routine concern.

The research does not shed sufficient light on the underlying reason to draw a hard conclusion regarding the cause, though evidence suggests that a combination of various factors is most likely. For example, this could be because bothered tenants are sufficiently successful in working out a solution with their neighbors that they don’t feel a need to call the landlord. Equally, it may also be attributed to tenants choosing not to raise complaints out of a desire not to annoy their landlord. And it may also be because there are both tenants and landlords who perceive secondhand smoke as an inevitable annoyance and not a landlord-tenant issue. Each of these are likely contributory, though to what degree it is difficult to gauge from these findings.

Those who have dealt with such complaints often explain that there is no easy or foolproof solution for dealing with this issue, other than simply to ask tenants to be considerate.

- *“We have a problem with smoke going into the other peoples’ windows. So I have to send them a letter asking them to please smoke on the downside of your neighbor.”*
- *“We request that they stay 25 feet away, but it’s very difficult to enforce.”*

In Clark County, however, some of the smoking-permitted landlords claim that secondhand drifting smoke is simply not a problem at all. *“I’ve never had anyone complain about smoke drifting into their apartment.”*

#### **D. HEALTH ISSUES GENERALLY, AND SECONDHAND SMOKE SPECIFICALLY, ARE NOT MAJOR MOTIVATORS FOR THE LANDLORDS INTERVIEWED.**

Landlords certainly recognize that smoking is harmful to *smokers*. Every participant understands this aspect of the impact of smoking, without debate. *“It’s a fatal addiction.”* There is also agreement that *“a lot of smokers are trying to quit.”* Further, participants recognize secondhand smoke *around children* as particularly harmful and they recognize that living in an apartment where there is regular exposure to secondhand smoke from someone smoking in the same unit is a health hazard.

However, with the exception of a few who have been impacted personally, landlords do not share as strong a concern about the impact of secondhand smoke that drifts in periodically from outdoors. It is seen, generally, as more of an annoyance than as a serious health issue.

It isn’t that landlords don’t believe smoking is harmful – they know that it is. It is just that, as described earlier, once smoking is taken outdoors, its impact on the *business* of landlording is perceived as slight – and that is highly significant to the decision-making process. Suggesting that landlords regulate tenant behavior for reasons that go beyond basic business goals raises some important landlord-tenant questions that most landlords, understandably, would prefer to leave alone.

An explanation for this, drawn from our expertise in landlord-tenant issues, may help clarify the issue: Skilled landlords know that setting rules that go beyond legitimate business needs is generally unwise, sometimes illegal, and always hard to defend if civil rights questions are raised in relation to the practice. In some states, for example, it is simply illegal for a landlord to set screening criteria or lease rules that do not relate to a legitimate business purpose – a construct in law intended to prevent a broad range of unacceptable discriminatory practices. As such, the national tone in landlord education for some time now has been to draw a bright line between the acceptability of practices that relate to legitimate business needs and the unacceptability of designing policy based on unrelated personal opinions about other types of behavior or characteristics. As such, many landlords don't feel comfortable regulating tenant behavior if the apparent reason for doing so seems to stretch beyond legitimate business purposes.

In light of this perspective, the fact that many landlords currently agree that *indoor* smoking harms their bottom line while the impact of *outdoor* smoking is seen as comparatively slight, is highly relevant to their comfort level in going the next step to banning tobacco use, not just inside, but property-wide.

#### **E. LANDLORDS PERCEIVE THAT NON-SMOKERS OFTEN “TAKE BETTER CARE OF THEMSELVES AND THEIR HOMES.”**

The issue of smoking clearly raises some slightly uncomfortable issues of a new kind of “class” distinction. Many struggle to find a way to express opinions about smokers without sounding uncomfortably judgmental. There is, for example, clear agreement among landlords, especially those who have non-smoking policies, that tenants who do not smoke are more health-conscious and therefore tend to be more conscientious as tenants as well. *“With non-smokers you get people who take better care of their home, because they take better care of themselves.”* A few also believe that non-smokers, in general, are more responsible with their money as well: *“Non-smokers are smarter. They’ve got a better background, they know how to handle money better. For one thing, they’re not wasting money on cigarettes.”*

In each focus group, the discussion around this point takes on an interesting tone as participants search for the appropriate words to describe their perception. Some plainly believe that lower income people are more likely to be indoor smokers and, as such, feel some discomfort in describing their policies – as if a non-smoking rule is somehow a backdoor method to deny an otherwise protected class (it is not). In addition, some of the smoking-permitted landlords believe that only “high-end” rentals could successfully implement non-smoking rules without risking vacancies. In contrast, just as the tenant survey indicated as well, the non-smoking landlords describe their rental units as covering a range of rent amounts from low-income/subsidized to higher end.

This is, in our view, a good example of how the perception of an issue can be out of alignment with the reality of it. The tenant research we conducted showed no substantial variation in indoor smoking practices by income, and this is ultimately validated by the landlords interviewed as well, but only when the question is asked from a different angle. When landlords are asked about their tenants' *actual* indoor smoking practices, with a singular exception, each smoking-permitted landlord acknowledged that the majority of their *smoking* tenants choose not to smoke inside their own units. In other words, while the reality is that non-smoking rentals are more attractive to the overwhelming majority of

tenants from all income ranges, and even a majority of smokers as well, the perception held by some landlords is different. That is, until prompted about it, many don't draw a distinction between people who smoke generally and people who smoke indoors.

**F. DESPITE THEIR EXPRESSED JUDGMENTS ABOUT SMOKERS, VIRTUALLY ALL LANDLORDS INTERVIEWED HAVE SYMPATHY FOR THEIR SMOKING TENANTS AS WELL.**

Most landlords, even those who forbid smoking indoors, are reluctant to force a long-time tenant who has always smoked indoors to take it outside. Whether smoking indoors has been grandfathered for a long-time tenant or is generally permitted, landlords acknowledge that only a minority of the smokers who live in their units are choosing to smoke inside. One landlord, who currently allows smoking and is considering changing that policy, explains that, while most of his smoking tenants already take it outside, his tenants who still smoke inside tend to do so for reasons of mobility or other limitations, such as being confined to a wheelchair.

**G. ALL RECOGNIZE THAT THE SOCIETAL TREND IS TOWARD MORE RESTRICTIONS ON SMOKING.**

Landlords are aware that society is moving toward more and more restrictions on smoking. *"People are used to no-smoking rules, like at restaurants; it's everywhere nowadays."* Most accept the trend and understand that social pressure toward restrictions on smoking has grown along with rising awareness of smoking's danger and changes in societal attitudes about smoking. While most are either accepting or openly supportive of the trend, a comparative few are not as comfortable. As one ex-smoker comments, *"I bet within a few years, it will be illegal to smoke inside your car with kids"* (a change that we understand is already occurring in some jurisdictions).

**H. NOT ALL ARE CLEAR ON THE EXTENT TO WHICH A LANDLORD CAN LIMIT SMOKING.**

While most landlords understand that they can set non-smoking policies, a few of those who permit smoking think they *must* do so. Also, a few of those who forbid indoor smoking think they must allow it outside.

**I. WHILE THEIR EXPERIENCE VALIDATES THE TENANT RESEARCH RESULTS, THEIR ASSUMPTIONS DON'T ALWAYS.**

This is a curious finding and important for crafting communication messages. It works like this for many of the participants: Tell a landlord that 9 out of 10 renters live in smokefree homes and many are skeptical – particularly those who currently allow smoking. Ask that same landlord to estimate how many of their tenants smoke and then to estimate how many of those tenants still do so inside their units, and they almost universally validate the same percentage found in the research – within about five percentage points. In other words, landlords, perhaps like most of us, have not separated in our minds the difference between the incidence of smoking in the population and the incidence of smoking inside homes.

### III. The Non-Smoking Choice: *Perspectives of Landlords Who Forbid Indoor Smoking*

What stands out in this research is a stark difference in perspectives between landlords who allow smoking and those who do not. Landlords all see the same issues and drawbacks to smoking, yet what they do about it is totally different. The differences were so striking that it was sometimes hard to believe they live in the same communities. In this section we'll describe the worldview of no-smoking landlords, including how they came to the decision to institute non-smoking policies, and how they manage and enforce those policies. Then, in the section following, we'll contrast their opinions with those of landlords who continue to allow smoking.

#### A. THE DECISION TO CONVERT TO NON-SMOKING IS MOST COMMONLY TRIGGERED BY A PARTICULARLY NASTY AND EXPENSIVE CLEAN-UP.

There are basically three ways in which the no-smoking landlords made the choice to have a non-smoking policy for their properties. In order of frequency, they are:

- ▶ **"Last straw" clean-up situations.** Most commonly what motivated owners or management companies to switch to non-smoking was one final, outrageously expensive clean-up situation. Replacing carpet in a very short time period ("*after just 6 weeks,*" for example) was the "*last straw*" for more than one landlord. Other horror stories include:
  - "*We had one unit where we had to replace the carpets in four months due to smoking. There were burns, overflowing ashtrays all over. At that point we decided it was best for us and our expenses, and for the tenants themselves, to be in non-smoking units.*"
  - "*We had a chain-smoking resident and when they left it cost us \$7,000 to rehab the unit and get out the odor. Then we just said, 'no more.'*"
  - "*We evicted some chain smokers and it cost us \$13,000 to redo everything, from the ceilings to the electrical outlets. I think even the light bulbs smelled.*"
  - "*We had a lady on an oxygen tank who smoked nonstop. When she finally left to go to a hospice, there were smoke burns everywhere. We were amazed the unit hadn't burned down. The places where pictures had been were a white square and everything else was yellow. That was the defining moment where we said it's time to make a change.*"

Somewhat less dramatically, other landlords describe a gradual wearing-down process in which they got fed up and finally decided they were tired of paying to deal with the mess. "*For me it was the repainting each time, the extent of cleaning, professional carpet cleaners, hoping you would get the smell out. I just finally decided it wasn't worth it.*"

- ▶ **Remodeled or new units that landlords wish to keep fresh.** In several cases, the conversion to non-smoking is inspired by a specific rehab or new construction and a desire to keep the new units cleaner longer:
  - "*I recently built a dozen row houses. I wanted to keep them as new as possible and not have smoke seep from one to the other, so I decided to rent them all non-smoking right from the start.*"

- *“It started with some furnished apartments we had and we wanted to keep the smell out of the furniture. That worked so well, we converted all our units over.”*
  - *“We just recently remodeled a small house, and smoke was on the windows, the carpeting, everything. We want to keep it nice and clean from now on, so we made it non-smoking.”*
- ▶ **Personal stories of loss from smoking.** A few of the landlords say they haven’t allowed smoking on their properties *“from the beginning.”* These tend to be people who have strong personal convictions against smoking, generally based on seeing smoking’s most catastrophic impacts up close. For example, one landlord explained that he wanted no part of smoking because *“I had two brothers die young from smoking.”* These are the landlords whose convictions and motivations align most closely to that of the agencies and organizations sponsoring this research. They are also, however, the landlords who least need communication about the importance or value of switching to non-smoking. They already know smoking is unhealthy and already are committed to doing what they can to make sure it doesn’t happen in their properties.

## **B. WITHOUT EXCEPTION, LANDLORDS WHO DON’T ALLOW INDOOR SMOKING WOULD NEVER, EVER GO BACK.**

During the course of this research, we spoke with 17 landlords in focus groups who implemented non-smoking policies, as well as with additional property management association professionals who happen to have non-smoking policies. What stands out from all our interviews with landlords who prohibit smoking is that exactly *zero* regret doing so and *none* are considering going back to allowing smoking in any unit where it has been prohibited. Indeed, many said that once they tried non-smoking in one property they quickly wanted it in all.

Equally, we found no landlords who currently permit smoking who had limited smoking elsewhere in the past. In short, it is apparent that, when landlords elect to implement non-smoking policies, the odds are very great that they will never look back.

Benefits cited by landlords who no longer allow smoking inside their units include:

- ▶ **Tenants want non-smoking units.** These landlords agree they have no problem renting out their non-smoking units. Frankly, they acknowledge the reality of what the earlier tenant research also indicates: offering non-smoking appears to provide a competitive advantage. *“We have a wait list.” “We had an entire building lease up in just 30 days, because people were calling specifically for non-smoking units.”* Some, but not all, report that prospective tenants are specifically asking for non-smoking. *“Non-smoking is another amenity that we offer to attract people.”* Landlords also note that the smell of a smoking unit can turn away prospective tenants: *“It’s like buying a used car – if it smells like smoke you’re not going to buy it.”*

Importantly, many of these landlords find that *smokers* as well as non-smokers want to live in their non-smoking units. *“It seems like most of my tenants are smokers, but they still want non-smoking units.”* One long-time no-smoking landlord concludes that today, unlike what might have been true in the past, there are no financial risks to going non-smoking.

- ▶ **The units stay cleaner, are easier to maintain, and have significantly lower turnover costs.** Landlords wholeheartedly agree it pays to prevent smoking in their units. Unlike with the mess and damage caused by smoking, the cost and time spent when “turning” a non-smoking unit is minimal — *“all you have to do is a quick touch-up of the paint.”* One landlord goes so far as to describe it this way: *“Renting to smokers is going to kill your bottom line – it’s really all about the numbers. You take the worst non-smoking tenant you ever had, who just trashed the place, and it is a quarter of the cost you face to clean up after a smoker.”* While we are not convinced that his statement about the worst non-smoking tenant one has ever had would hold up for all landlords, it is still a strong indicator of how beneficial the conversion to non-smoking has been for his business.
- ▶ **“Higher quality” of tenants attracted by no-smoking policy.** As described in some detail earlier, landlords have a sense that people who appreciate non-smoking units are more responsible in other ways as well. Indeed, from a number of non-smoking landlords — both in the focus groups and the expert interviews — we hear a sense that they feel they have found a solution that seems almost too good to be true, as if they have found an easy method to prevent a variety of less responsible individuals from applying to rent their units. Perhaps it works this way: While most tenants who smoke indoors are, like most other tenants, responsible people who would otherwise care for the unit and pay on time, it may also be the case that the very small percentage of highly irresponsible renters that exist in the market are also disproportionately likely to want to smoke indoors as well. In other words, an unexpected but highly desirable outcome is that non-smoking properties may experience a lower incidence of other seemingly unrelated harmful behaviors.
- ▶ **Some are getting a break on their insurance.** A few of the non-smoking landlords say an additional benefit is their insurance rates are lower as a result of prohibiting smoking in their units. *“I have an incentive in terms of my insurance costs by having non-smoking units.”* Not everyone is aware of this potential benefit, however. In each group landlords are quite interested to hear the name of the insurance company offering a discount for non-smoking. Companies named by participants include Farmers and AIG. (We have not verified whether these companies offer such discounts.)
- ▶ **The public health benefit is a lesser consideration for most.** Landlords who do not allow smoking often see the health benefits of restricting smoking as a worthwhile side benefit, but a much less important motivator than lowering their cost of doing business. For just a few of the participants — principally those who describe having family die from smoking’s impact — health concerns are a primary motivator. *“For us, the main thing was the health of the tenants.”* These folks have been personally impacted by smoking, for example the landlord with asthma or the man whose two brothers died young due to smoking.

### C. HOW THEY DID IT: OFTEN A GRADUAL PROCESS, BUT FOR SOME, IT'S AS EASY AS "CHANGING THE AD."

When asked to describe how they changed over their properties to non-smoking, landlords make it sound a lot less complicated than we expected. The main point is that a conversion to non-smoking can't happen instantly, but needs to be phased in over time, as units "turn" and new tenants come in.

Most participants describe a gradual, yet relatively rapid, straightforward process in which one building, unit, or floor of a building converts, with new tenants coming in informed that these are now non-smoking units. Typical accounts of gradual conversions include:

- ▶ *"It's not hard. You just change the ad to say 'non smoking.'"*
- ▶ *"As we turned over units, we posted a sign saying it was non-smoking."*
- ▶ *"It started with a couple floors. We told people that in a year it would be non-smoking, and we'd give them resources to help quit."*
- ▶ *"Say in a triplex you've got two tenants that smoke and one doesn't. One of the smokers leaves, so now you have a majority non-smokers, and you tell the next one who moves in, we've got a new policy. You give the last smoker 60 or 90 days' advance warning to stop smoking inside."*
- ▶ *"As a unit emptied, it became non-smoking. It was not like we turned the entire complex over immediately. But within two years, maybe less, it was totally non smoking."*

A couple of landlords describe the conversion process as "kind of difficult," and some have gone through a fairly complex transition. But much more often, once the decision was made, the actual transition is described as quick, in some cases even as simple as just saying non-smoking.

### D. ALMOST ALL FEEL OBLIGED TO "GRANDFATHER" THEIR LONG-TIME TENANTS WHO SMOKE.

An important exception to no-smoking landlords' policies is that nearly all of them feel they should allow long-time tenants who smoked in their units before the no-smoking policy was instituted to continue to do so until they leave (or die). While the number of tenants they have in this situation becomes small relatively quickly after they institute their no-smoking policies, landlords indicate that some remain for quite some time. For landlords, the key point is that these smokers are otherwise responsible tenants who pay on time. No matter how smelly their apartment, landlords are not going to tell these "grandfathered" tenants they must leave in order to find an apartment where they are allowed to smoke indoors. (There is likely, of course, a financial benefit as well in these cases, since the landlord can put off the investment of cleaning an already smoke-saturated unit for a bit longer, while still collecting rent from a responsible tenant.) Examples from landlords who otherwise don't allow smoking, include:

- ▶ *"I had a guy who was a cigar smoker, it was pretty bad. But he was such a great tenant, I wasn't going to mess with that. I knew he would move some day, and eventually he did."*

- ▶ *"We have a few tenants who have been there over 20 years, but once they leave and we renovate the apartment, from then on it's completely non-smoking."*
- ▶ *"We have one gentleman who's been there forever, he smokes so heavily his apartment is yellow inside. You expect any minute to get a call that he has died. But he clings on."*

Landlords agree that grandfathering *"is the tough part"* since other tenants sometimes are bothered by the smoke, or question why a neighbor is allowed to smoke when they are not. Also, of course, they are dealing with the ongoing safety hazard and they know that an ever-growing mess is waiting for them to clean up. But most prefer this approach to evicting a tenant for behavior that was allowed when the tenant moved in. They know that, likely sooner than later, voluntary turnover – *"it's only a matter of time"* – will take care of the problem and they will be able to convert these last few hold-outs to clean, no-smoking units.

#### **E. HOW THEY ENFORCE IT: SOME LANDLORDS CREATE NON-SMOKING UNITS WITH WRITTEN RULES, OTHERS HAVE VERBAL AGREEMENTS.**

Non-smoking rules are established with everything from separately signed lease addenda to verbal agreements sealed with a handshake. However, most landlords get the no-smoking rule in writing, through an addendum or clause built into their lease or rental agreement. Some accomplish this through statements as simple as saying, *"This is a non-smoking unit,"* others specify the conditions and rules in much more detail, and still others don't technically forbid smoking, but simply promise to make it very expensive if tenants elect to smoke.

- ▶ *"We do an addendum to the lease, and tenants have to sign it."*
- ▶ *"I have them sign a thing saying that if they smoke they are responsible for bringing it back to condition, including drapes, carpets. So they're on the hook for several thousand dollars. So far it's been bulletproof."*
- ▶ Many make the comparison to cut-and-dried *"no pet"* policies. *"Our company has policies on pets and smoking, to protect our property."* Also, landlords are quite clear with their tenants *"up front"* that the no-smoking rules include *"their friends, their relatives, their visitors, everyone."*
- ▶ Some landlords simply talk to their tenants and ask them not to smoke inside. The only consequence might be that upon move-out, the landlord keeps the security deposit to help cover cleaning costs. *"Most of the time we tell tenants no smoking allowed, but they can smoke outside, and they say okay, no problem. They know if they smoke inside, they will kiss their security deposit goodbye."*

Enforcement of no-smoking rules runs the gamut from fines and evictions to verbal reminders. Most land somewhere in the middle by keeping an eye on tenants who smoke and checking for ashtrays and *"that smell"* every time they are in the unit.

Some landlords rely merely on verbal warnings for enforcement. These landlords often complain they have to ask tenants *"over and over"* to stop smoking inside, and they are



sometimes doubtful that the rule is always followed. As we would expect, some, but not all, experienced landlords interviewed have a clear, comfortable understanding of how landlord-tenant law works in their state and have adopted procedures based on automatically following the legal options for lease enforcement. As we would also expect, these are the landlords whose answers are least ambiguous regarding the effectiveness of their enforcement approaches. Examples include:

- ▶ *“Our policy is that we charge \$250 on first offense. If they don’t pay, they get a notice to vacate. On the second offense we fine them and ask them to leave.”* (Clark County, Washington)
- ▶ *“We give them a verbal warning, send in maintenance for a follow- up inspection, then a 10-day notice if they’ re still doing it.”* (Clark County, Washington)
- ▶ *“They have 14 days to cure, then within 30 days we’ll follow it up with another inspection. If the violation reoccurs within 6 months, they get 10 days’ notice. So I point this out to them in the lease, saying be sure to read this; if I catch you smoking, you’ll be evicted. It’s almost an empty threat, they might light up the minute I drive away. But if I catch them, they’re out. I try to reason with them, then follow up with a solid threat.”* (Portland, Oregon)

#### F. NEARLY EVERYONE IS RELUCTANT TO MAKE THEIR ENTIRE PROPERTY SMOKEFREE.

While smoking is sometimes forbidden in some outdoor common areas such as a pool area, only a couple of the no-smoking landlords have a policy against smoking anywhere on their property. One landlord states, for example: *“I don’t want any smokers, period.”* By the end of the discussion, a few of the no-smoking landlords say they are *“considering extending it out”* to outdoor areas as well. It’s clear, however, that an extension of no-smoking rules to the entire property is an additional step most landlords are not quite ready to take.

In general, making the entire property a no-smoking area is seen as too extreme. Indeed, this is one issue where the no-smoking and smoking-permitted landlords express similar viewpoints. Reasons for landlords not to extend no-smoking rules to the entire property include:

- ▶ **Philosophical conviction that smoking tenants have *“a right to smoke somewhere.”*** It’s one thing to restrict smoking inside the unit, but most landlords are reluctant to prohibit their smoking tenants from smoking anywhere on the property. In other words, the no-smoking landlords apply to smoking outside the same *“it’s their right”* viewpoint that smoking-permitted landlords express regarding smoking inside. *“Smoking is not an illegal activity, they have a right to do it.”* Coupled with this concern may be a perception that, while many smokers today are accustomed to taking their cigarettes outside, not as many are accustomed to having to walk some distance from their homes to smoke.
- ▶ **Concerns and misperceptions that they can’t legally restrict smoking on property.** Although most landlords understand that smokers are not a protected class, there is some confusion, even among the no-smoking folks, about whether they are within their rights to forbid all smoking on their property. Consider the different types of misperceptions implied in the following statements:

- *“You can’t tell them they can’t smoke, that’s discrimination. But you can say you can’t smoke inside.”*
  - *“The law doesn’t prevent them from smoking outside; their neighbors just have to live with it.”*
- ▶ **Reluctance and perceived difficulty to “police.”** Without a more compelling business reason to do so, landlords are not eager to take on yet another rule to monitor and enforce. And as long as other tenants are not complaining too much about the secondhand smoke and the cigarette butts aren’t making too huge a mess, the smoking-outside compromise appears to work reasonably well. *“I’ve got enough to do; I don’t want to enforce no smoking on the entire property.”*

## IV. The Choice to Allow Smoking: *Perspectives of Smoking-Permitted Landlords*

In discussing their fellow landlords who allow smoking inside rental units, the no-smoking landlords express amazement that anyone would needlessly endure the costly mess of allowing smoking in their units. In sharp contrast, landlords who permit smoking often don't believe that trying a non-smoking policy could be a viable business option. While those who have converted their units to non-smoking would never go back – and have plainly profited from the decision – many of those who haven't converted to non-smoking seem all but convinced that it would be business suicide to attempt it. The two perspectives are so entirely different that they seem characteristic of variations one finds between the cultures in two countries than between competing businesspeople working in the very same market.

### A. MOST WHO ALLOW SMOKING WOULD PREFER TO BE SMOKEFREE, "IF THEY COULD."

It was very striking that most of these landlords agree that *"if possible,"* they would prefer not to allow smoking at their properties. *"I would be really happy if we switched to non-smoking."* Again, the reason for the desire is to avoid the costly mess of smoking cleanups. One landlord who currently allows smoking half-joked about a unique approach he has considered that would help his tenants and his bottom line: *"I've thought about going in with a hypnotherapist to help people quit, it costs them so much money to buy cigarettes, they could put that toward their rent!"*

Despite a wistful desire to convert to non-smoking, these landlords clearly perceive non-smoking policies as a new, risky, and quite untested idea. *"I'd like to see if it would work, but I don't want to be the pioneer."* To borrow from the language of high technology, these landlords are not early adopters. The key reasons these landlords don't want to try non-smoking, in order of importance, include:

- ▶ **Occupancy/vacancy assumptions and concerns, based on deep assumption that they would lose tenants and it wouldn't work.** Many are fearful of losing business, making the assumption both that most smokers still smoke inside and that non-smokers who wish to avoid smoking wouldn't find the change an attractive amenity. The number-one driver of the smoking-permitted perspective is not a preference for smoking, but their conviction that if they go non-smoking, they will lose tenants. As one landlord opined, *"I would tell my owners, if you go non-smoking you're eliminating a certain amount of tenants. We would really limit ourselves to the amount of tenants we could attract."* These landlords reason that since *"smokers are out there"* and *"they have to live somewhere,"* therefore they have to be allowed to smoke inside their homes. *"I know people are smoking. I'm afraid if I go to no smoking, we'd have far fewer tenants."*

It is interesting to note that, even without showing the tenant research data or the testimonials from landlords who have non-smoking policies, most of the smoking-permitted landlords acknowledge that their smoking tenants do tend to smoke outside. Despite this reality, this is not top-of-mind information for most of these landlords, who

often assume that having smoking tenants automatically and necessarily equates to allowing smoking inside the units.

- ▶ **Perception that only high-end rentals can be non-smoking.** A related perception among smoking-permitted landlords is that only high-end units can be non-smoking, and that any lower-end units they have must remain smoking. However, this assumption is not borne out by the low-cost units offered successfully by the non-smoking landlords. Nor is it borne out by the experience of non-smoking landlords who typically convert all units – high- or low-end – to non-smoking once they experience that the upside (less cleaning cost) does not have a downside (demand for units doesn't decline, but actually increases).
- ▶ **Discomfort about telling people what to do in their homes or that there is a “right” to smoke.** While smoking-permitted landlords often wish they didn't have to deal with smoky apartments, they tend to have a fatalistic conviction that they have “no choice” but to continue to allow smoking, out of a belief that it is their tenants' right to smoke in their own home. *“My tenants say they've paid their rent, they have a right to do whatever they want.”* One participant even argues that allowing smoking, in some instances, may be a “reasonable accommodation” issue – that a tenant may suffer from a mental illness and depend on cigarettes “like medicine.” In general it appears that these landlords simply feel they have to provide housing where smokers are allowed to smoke wherever they like. *“I think people have the right to do what they want to do in their own homes.”*
- ▶ **Having to police one more rule.** Landlords also express skepticism about their ability to enforce no-smoking policies. *“If someone's going to smoke, you can't stop them.”* A few are concerned that allowing smoking only outside will simply create new enforcement problems due to drifting smoke. *“I think telling people to only smoke outside might be an issue – they would smoke outside, and then we'd get complaints about smoke going into other apartments.”*

## APPENDIX

---

---

The following description of research results was provided, at the end of the groups, to all participants:

Summary of key findings from:

## **SMOKEFREE RENTAL HOUSING IN THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA**

Telephone survey research was conducted with 400 tenants in Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington County, Oregon and in Clark County, Washington.<sup>1</sup> The research was conducted for the American Lung Association of Oregon; Multnomah County, Oregon; Clark County, Washington; and partner agencies. The research was conducted in June and July of 2006, by Campbell DeLong Resources, Inc.

The research results show that, in addition to the established health benefits of smokefree housing as a reason for landlords to implement such policies, a landlord who wishes to attract a large number of quality applicants will gain a distinct competitive advantage by offering housing that is smokefree. Four key facts support this finding:

1. Eight in ten tenants live in dwellings where they do not allow smoking inside and, from a practical standpoint, *nine out of ten* live in dwellings that are virtually smoking free — that is, indoor smoking is a rare event. Only 11% allow smoking inside their home on any type of regular basis today.
2. Eight out of ten tenants also *agree* that daily exposure to even small amounts of secondhand smoke is a serious health risk, including *two-thirds of current smokers* who agree with this. In addition, and perhaps as a consequence, very few take issue with the concept of landlords prohibiting tenants from smoking in their own homes, while *three-quarters of all tenants* endorse the idea.
3. *Three-quarters* of all metro-area renters agree that “*other things being equal,*” they would choose a rental home where the landlord forbids smoking and *half* of tri-county area renters would choose a rental community where smoking is forbidden even if other things are *not* equal — that is, they would pay a little more, or perhaps be willing to trade out some other convenience, such as proximity to a desired location.
4. *Four out of ten* renters say they would not be comfortable renting an apartment where *adjacent* tenants smoke. This means that landlords who permit smoking in adjacent units are at a distinct market disadvantage with 42% of the market, while gaining favor with perhaps 1 in 10 — the 11% who allow smoking in their homes on any type of regular basis.

There was likely a time, perhaps 20 or 30 years ago, when smoking was so prevalent that forbidding it may have put a landlord at a market disadvantage, but today the opposite is plainly the case. The fact that landlords who have smokefree policies are still in the minority suggests that many are missing an opportunity to gain a competitive edge.

<sup>1</sup> For a complete copy of the report and detailed discussion of the findings, visit: [www.lungoregon.org](http://www.lungoregon.org).